



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/615,844	07/13/2000	Takahiro Mizuguchi	S0255.0003/P003	6780

24998 7590 07/27/2004

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP
2101 L STREET NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20037-1526

EXAMINER

NOBAHAR, ABDULHAKIM

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2132

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

24

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/615,844

Applicant(s)

MIZUGUCHI, TAKAHIRO

Examiner

Abdulkhakim Nobahar

Art Unit

2132

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 May 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 19-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 19-36 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Arguments

1. This communication is in response to applicant's amendment received on May 07, 2004.

2. The cancellation of claims 2-18 and the addition of new claims 19-36 are acknowledged and that these new claims introduce new limitations to the previous claimed invention.

3. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

4. Applicant on page 9, lines 4-5, argues "the cited references even when considered in combination fail to disclose, teach or suggest the limitations of claim 1".

Savitzky teaches a system that various clients (corresponding to the recited subscribers) access various servers (corresponding to the recited a service provision unit) to receive services (see, for example, abstract, col. 3, lines 45-55, Fig. 1 and col. 5, lines 1-35). Savitzky further teaches a personal information agency (corresponding to the recited an input-output control unit) that is coupled to both servers and clients and controls the interactions between them (see, for example, col. 5, lines 19-27 and col. 9, line 34-col. 10, line 30). The agency receives the client requests and passes to the target server and the server transmits the requested document back to the agency. Then the agency output the requested document to the client.

Rautila (see, for example, col. 5, lines 39-51 and col. 9, line 65-col. 10, line 8) teaches at least one server with database (corresponding to the recited a service provision unit) that provides a user (corresponding to the recited subscriber) with a requested service. The service is provided to the user after it is verified that the user in fact is an authorized user. Rautila also teaches that the user must sign the request with a secret key (corresponding to the recited an authentication code) in order to be authorized and be allowed to access a database.

Therefore, the combination of both references disclose the limitations of claim 1 and at the time the invention was made, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching of Rautila with the teaching of Savitzky in order to have a secure system for providing services to subscribers from servers with databases of information.

5. In light of the above submission the previous rejection of claims 1 is maintained.

Previous rejection of Claim 1:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Savitzky et al (6,012,083; Hereinafter Savitzky) in view of Rautila et al (6,549,625; hereinafter Rautila).

Regarding claim 1, Savitzky discloses an information input-output device comprising:

a service provision unit which has a database relating to services that can be provided to a subscriber (col. 2, lines 12-19, col. 5, lines 1-11, col. 11, lines 48-52, Fig. 1, item 14, where the web server is service provision unit and the users of the clients are subscribers); and

an input-output control unit which receives data from said service provision unit and outputs the data , wherein

data in the database is read out through operation from said input-output control unit (see, for example, col. 5, lines 19-27 and col. 9, line 34-col. 10, line 30, where agency corresponds to the recited input-output control unit). Sakovitzky does not expressly disclose:

the service provision unit verifies whether a person trying to access the database is a subscriber who can be provided with the variety of services;

an authentication code is entered into said input-output control unit from which the data is desired to be output, and when the person is authenticated by said service provision unit as a subscriber who can be provided with the service, said input-output control unit receives the data and then outputs the data.

Raulita, however, teaches that the information transmitted from the transceiver of the mobile terminal may be signed with a secret key (corresponding to the recited an authentication code) by the user to permit database verification of the user (col. 5, lines 39-51). The database checks the validity of the user's signature and then transmits the stored information associated with the identification information to the mobile terminal.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the signing of the request (i.e., entering an authentication code into input-output control unit) by the user as taught by Raulita in the system of Savitzky in order to authenticate the user prior to the provision of a service to the agency (i.e., input-output device).

Election/Restrictions

Newly submitted claims 19-36 directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons:

Claims 19-26

These claims directed to an information input/output system that includes the following new limitations that are not found in the original claimed invention:

a data storage unit configured to store data;

Art Unit: 2132

the server is configured to allow the controller to access the data in the data storage unit, and output the data accessed, when the authentication code received coincides with one of the plurality of authentication codes stored in the server;

the data stored in the data storage unit is data that has been fetched by a scanner;

the authentication code is received by the controller via a magnetic card or an IC card;

the data is output by being printed out by an external device connected to the controller;

the controller is configured to receive the output job code, and to perform money charging and the output of the data both corresponding to the output job code;

the data is output by being printed out by an external device connected to the controller; and

the mobile communication terminal is configured to display a route to a location of the external device.

Claims 27-32

These claims directed to an information input/output system that includes the following new limitations that are not found in the original claimed invention:

a data storage unit configured to store data;

a server connected to the data storage unit and configured to store a plurality of authentication codes related to a plurality of users;

a mobile communication terminal configured to receive an authentication code related to a user of the mobile communication terminal and to transmit the authentication code received to the controller, wherein

the data storage unit is configured to transmit the data to the mobile communication terminal,

the server is configured to allow the controller to output the data received by the mobile communication terminal, and perform money charging corresponding to the output of the data, when the authentication code received coincides with one of the plurality of authentication codes stored in the server;

the authentication code is received by the controller via a magnetic card or an IC card;

the data is output by being printed out by an external device connected to the controller; and

the mobile communication terminal is configured to display a route to a location of the external device.

Claim 33

This claim directed to a server that includes the following new limitations that are not found in the original claimed invention:

means for issuing the user a code corresponding to the data output process and for notifying the user of the code; and

means for transmitting the stored data to the user when the code is entered by the user.

Claim 34

This claim directed to an input/output controller that includes the following new limitations that are not found in the original claimed invention:

a first interface configured to receive from a user a code corresponding to a data output process requested by the user;

a second interface configured to receive, from a server, data which has been stored in the server, the data corresponding to the code; and

a third interface configured to output the data via an output device.

Claim 35

This claim directed to an input/output control method that includes the following new limitations that are not found in the original claimed invention:

receiving data corresponding to a data output process requested by a user;

storing the data received;

issuing the user a code corresponding to the data output process; notifying the user of the code; and

transmitting the stored data to the user when the code is entered by the user.

Claim 36

This claim directed to an input/output control method, which includes the following new limitations that are not found in the original claimed invention:

receiving, from a user, a code corresponding to a data output process requested by the user;

receiving, from a server, data which has been stored in the server, the data corresponding to the code; and

outputting the data via an output device.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 19-36 withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Conclusion

Regarding claim 1 **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Abdulhakim Nobahar whose telephone number is 703-305-8074. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 703-305-1830. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Abdulhakim Nobahar
Examiner
Art Unit 2132

Justin Darrow
JUSTIN T. DARROW
PRIMARY EXAMINER

AN
July 21, 2004